

REMARKS

Claim Amendments

Applicant has canceled claims 1-35 without prejudice as drawn to a non-elected invention. Applicant has amended claim 36 to a method claim to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Applicant has added new claims 37-58, which depend from claim 36. A complete listing of all the claims, in compliance with the revised amendment format, is shown above.

Amended claim 36 is fully supported by the specification as filed, for example, at page 12, lines 13-26; page 14, line 12 to page 15, line 7; page 16, lines 3-8; and page 21. New claims 37-57 are fully supported by the specification as filed. Support for claims 37 and 38 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 19, 66, and 72-73. Support for claim 39 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 10, 13, and 16. Support for claim 40 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 8, 12, 14, and 21. Support for claim 41 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 16 and 21. Support for claims 42-44 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 16, 21, and 44-45. Support for claims 45-47 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 16, 21, and 41-42. Support for claims 48-49 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 17 and 43. Support for claims 50-52 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 18, 21-22, and 41-42. Support for claim 53 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 18, 24, and 30. Support for claim 54 appears at, *inter alia*, pages 17 and 18. Support for claims 55-56 appears at, *inter alia*, page 19. Support for claim 57 appears at, *inter alia*, page 184 (Table III). Additional support for claims 36-57 can be found throughout the specification. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

The Office rejected claim 36 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office alleges that since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what the Applicant is intending to encompass. The Applicant has amended claim 36 to a method claim containing steps, thus rendering the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejection.

35 USC § 101 Rejection

The Office rejected claim 36 under 35 USC § 101 as allegedly being not a proper process claim. The Applicant has amended claim 36 to a method claim setting forth the steps involved in the process, thus rendering the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 USC §101 rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests the claim amendments to be entered and the remarks considered. Applicant believes that with this amendment, the claims are in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: August 2, 2005

By:



Anita Terpstra
Registration No. 47,132